

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Vice Chair Rosenbaum called a special meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m., **Wednesday, May 19, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Shakil Patel

Commissioners Absent: Randy Neff, Chair
Eric Essex

Staff Present: Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

Guest: Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Director Woldruff stated that there were no items to add or delete. However, she added that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) listed under Item E.1, of the General Plan Update Project, was available but that the Response to Comments was not ready. She explained that the Planning Commission could receive public testimony on the Report, however no discussion on the Draft EIR could occur.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public participation.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-29 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT - The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Director Woldruff gave a brief staff report stating that this item was continued from the May 5, 2004 meeting. She added that the elements to be discussed included the Housing Element (Element 5.0) and the General Plan Implementation Programs Element (Element 11.0). She informed the Commission that staff had received a letter of comment from Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Avenue, in Redlands, which will be added to the Planning Commission packet for the next meeting.

Director Woldruff explained that the agenda for the Planning Commission meeting on June 9, 2004 would address specific projects that were being processed and the meeting of June 23, 2004 would deal with the changes to the Hillside Mixed-Use designation, other changes that resulted from Planning Commission discussions and letters of comment and letters from residents on Barton Road, south west of Oakwood Drive pertaining to changes to the General Plan. Director Woldruff

suggested that the Planning Commission defer active discussion of the DEIR until the June 23, 2004 meeting. Ms. Woldruff concluded her report and stated that Lloyd Zola from LSA Associates was present to discuss the Housing Element and the Implementation Programs Element.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:05 pm.

Ms. Elizabeth Wright, Services Coordinator for the Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing (SCANPH), 33445 Wilshire Blvd, Los Angeles explained that SCANPH was a membership organization dedicated to the development, preservation and management of affordable housing throughout southern California for low income families. She continued to say that the organization worked with cities to improve land use and housing policies to advance the development of affordable housing.

Ms. Wright informed the Commission that SCANPH had reviewed the Housing Element looking for development standards in the General Plan that would conflict with the development of affordable housing. She explained that the focus of the review included the following issues:

- Parking requirements – SCANPH considered the regulations excessive and recommended that the City create minimum requirements for affordable housing projects. They also suggested that the City not require covered parking;
- Density – SCANPH recommended that the City increase the density to 40 units per acre as opposed to the 20 units per acre contained in the Housing Element;
- Multi-family housing - SCANPH stressed the need for more of this type of development for low and very low income households;
- Second units – Recent legislation (July 2003) regarding the requirement of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for second units stating that the process was ministerial. She added that she had met with staff and Mr. Zola on the issue.

Ms. Wright distributed copies of SCANPH's recommendation to the City of Loma Linda for the consideration of the Planning Commission: 1) Comments regarding the Housing Element of the Loma Linda General Plan on the issues of parking, site inventory, density, set-backs, coverage and height, and second units; 2) Density guide for affordable housing developers.

Mr. Dawkins Hodges, 2648 Cincinnati Street, in San Bernardino, Executive Director of the Neighborhood Housing Services of the Inland Empire (NHSIE), stated that he was a Board Member of SCANPH. He explained that the County of San Bernardino had approached the NHSIE and offered some Home Funds to develop a fourplex on Ohio Street in Loma Linda and that after meeting with staff, the project had to be redesigned to conform to the Loma Linda Municipal Code parking requirements.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum asked if SCANPH had any recommendations to make on mass transit being located near low income and affordable housing. Ms. Wright replied that they did not.

Commissioner Christianson asked if the Commission could dictate a density for non-profit development and require a different density in for-profit development. Director Woldruff replied that there were provisions in State law that would allow for some leeway that would allow the City to increase density for non-profit housing. She then asked Mr. Zola to address the concerns of all three people.

Mr. Zola explained that the other Elements of the draft General Plan were written for the long term, over 20 years, whereas the Housing Element was to be reviewed every 5 years as mandated by the State. He added that unlike the rest of the General Plan, the City's Housing Element is required by law to make provisions for future growth for all segments of the community very low, low, and moderate income, and provide its fair share of regional housing needs.

Mr. Zola then addressed Ms. Wright's concerns regarding lower parking requirements, density and second units. On the issue of lower parking requirements, he explained that the City could determine that if a developer was helping the City of Loma Linda to reach its fair share of regional housing, the City could grant a density bonus or other consideration such as cash, forgiveness of fees, etc in exchange for certain percentage of affordable housing, reduce the number of parking spaces, provide increased density for that affordable project or provide redevelopment assistance. As for the issue of the second units, Mr. Zola stated that there should be an ordinance regarding second units and a provision in the City's General Plan and that he would prepare language and bring it back for review by the Planning Commission.

On the issue of density, Mr. Zola explained that in cities where storefronts have housing above, the density could be as high as 40 to 50 units per acre. He added that what the draft General Plan was proposing as part of the Housing Element to deal with this density, was transit oriented development and residential and second floor over commercial. Mr. Zola explained that this type of apartment

style student housing would benefit the University and help the City of Loma Linda meet the State's requirement for affordable housing.

Mr. Zola explained that the Housing Element had to be reviewed certified by the California State Housing and Community Development (HCD). And he added that the City of Loma Linda's certified Element would allow the City to be eligible to receive affordable housing funds through the State to help the City meets its needs for affordable housing.

Commissioner Christianson asked if the determination of the density in various areas of the City was out of the City's hands. He also asked if the City should consider making the density uniform throughout. Director Woldruff replied that it was not necessarily out of the City's hands but the City did have to meet its goals. Mr. Zola added that the goal was to make the density appropriate to each mixed-use area. He continued to say that the Planning Commission had some flexibility because the City's obligation was to provide other considerations in affordable projects, which would be requesting a density bonus.

Commissioner Christianson continued to ask how the Planning Commission would know when to no longer approve requests for in-lieu payments for affordable housing. Director Woldruff replied that it was a City Council policy issue. She added that the Planning Commission had the ability to make a recommendation to the City Council on the Development Agreement whether or not it should be approved as submitted. She continued to say that the Commission's decision could be made based on the size of the project because affordable housing can be included in a larger project. Mr. Zola added to Director Woldruff's comments explaining in areas where the zoning code allowed it, duplexes and fourplexes were being built within an R-1 Single-family dwelling zone.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum opened the discussion on the Housing Element – Element 5, of the draft General Plan. The following items were discussed and recommendation for changes made as necessary.

- Page 5-3 – Homeless shelters. The issue is discussed later in the Housing Element. (See Table 5.J – Homeless Services in the Loma Linda Area, on Page 5-19 & Page 5-20).
- Page 5-9 – Solar Water Heating – Mr. Zola will add the word "water" in the first sentence as a clarification. A brief discussion ensued on the benefits of heating water with solar power.
- Page 5-9 – Density Bonus for Affordable Housing – Mr. Zola explained that the City's density bonus ordinance did not meet the requirements of State law and that the new Housing Element will meet those requirements. Ms. Woldruff added that the ordinance would be in effect as soon as the General Plan was adopted.
- Page 5-10 – Planned Unit Development and Planned Community Standards – Mr. Zola explained that the Planned Community designation allowed for clustering of development and permitting areas that have steep slopes or flood hazards to develop. He added that he would revise the section to clarify the language.

Mr. Glenn Elssmann, 24949 Prospect Ave, Loma Linda referred to the housing data provided in Table 5.A, Total Population, and Table 5.B, Population Projections, which could be interpreted to show that the City was not growing thus making it difficult to encourage business to settle in Loma Linda. Director Woldruff explained that the population figures in the Housing Element were the ones the State used for subventions and subsidies and that the Housing Element must be certified by the Housing and Community Development Department in order to receive this funding. Mr. Zola suggested that the population numbers in Table 5.A showing existing population in 2003 be deleted and have the text refer to the population for 2004 from the State Department of Finance. Mr. Zola summarized that the changes to be made to table 5.A was to eliminate the figures for 2003 and change the title of that table.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum had questions regarding a mass transit map, and where it could be incorporated in the Genera Plan in high-density housing and low income housing areas. Mr. Zola explained that mass transit was discussed in the Circulation Element as text but that there was no map because the mass transit routes change without notice. He suggested that a reference be added in the implementing policies in the Circulation Element to address the mass transit issue.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum turned to page 5-30 to discuss mixed-use areas. Mr. Zola stated that all revisions regarding the mixed-use areas would be made based on the discussion for the Land Use Element. Commissioner Christianson asked Mr. Zola if he could simplify the second paragraph bullet point in Mixed-Use Area B, as he found it quite confusing. Mr. Zola stated that he would revise the text to clarify its intent.

Commissioner Christianson asked if a bullet point could be added to indicate that Mission Road frontage would require a minimum lot size. He also wanted to discuss the density in the Mixed-Use Area E along Mission Road regarding the live/work artisans' studio environment. Mr. Zola replied that it was a land use issue covered in other sections of the Draft General Plan and added that

Section 5.0 was to identify standards and see if those standards prevent development in the City of Loma Linda. Vice Chair Rosenbaum asked Commissioner Christianson what changes he would like to make. He replied that he wanted to strike out the medium density designation along Mission Road. Director Woldruff explained that densities in the Draft General Plan reflected the suggestions received at the various public workshops on the subject of land use and that a lower density could hinder the City from reaching its affordable housing requirement and also render newly approved projects under these provisions as non-conforming. She added that the Planning Commission could make a recommendation to the City Council to change the density. A lengthy discussion on the issue ensued. Vice Chair Rosenbaum suggested that a clear definition of the live/work artisan designation be added to the General Plan. Director Woldruff agreed that language would be added.

Commissioner Christianson pointed out that Mixed-Use Area F was missing. Mr. Zola explained that Area F did not contain any housing so it was not included in the Housing Element. Director Woldruff added that currently storage units were located in Area F was.

Ms. Mary Lynn Cooke of 25340 Mead Street, Loma Linda asked if a situation could occur where strictly Planned Community projects were approved although a mixed-use designation on Mission Road was in existence. Director Woldruff explained that there were several combinations of mixed-use projects i.e., a commercial/commercial project or a commercial/residential combination of development. Mr. Zola explained that the issue in question should be addressed as part of the project approval and/or phasing, on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Cooke expressed her concern regarding commercial uses on Mission Road in view of the Mission Road Historic Overlay District. Director Woldruff explained that the south side of Mission Road was strictly designated residential except at the California Street intersection as described in the Overlay ordinance. The discussion continued regarding densities that the Planning Commission would approve for the area.

Mr. Elssmann addressed the Commission to speak to the comment by Commissioner Christianson that developers would always propose to build at the highest density and stated that it wasn't so. He reminded the Planning Commission that they had approved a project on Mission Road, Mission Trails, and that the density of the project was approximately 5 units per acre, which represents the low end of the 5-9 units per acre density, and that the project complied with the Mission Overlay District Ordinance requirements. He expressed his concern that the Planning Commission would change the densities on Mission Road when the goals and objectives that the Planning Commission had been met by the proposed development in that community. Mr. Elssmann continued to say that the mixed-use designation provided a range of densities and added that the land was never designated to be 1 to 2 units per acre.

Director Woldruff added to Mr. Elssmann's comment stating that one of the concerns that staff had was that there had been a change on the Planning Commission recently and up until that change, a strong focus of the Commission was for livable/walkable communities, neo-traditional design and small lot sub-divisions were part of that. She added that it is troubling for staff, considering the number of projects that have presented themselves.

Commissioner Christianson stated that he would like to go on record to advocate that type of development and stated that if small lots were going to be used then it was the duty of the Planning Commission to also reduce the sizes of the houses because in his experience in livable/walkable communities, the lots were small but the houses were smaller also. He added that the Planning Commission's role was to make sure that the livable/walkable communities concepts were applied in the correct manner.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum moved the discussion to page 5-31. She pointed out that Mixed-use Area D3 was missing. Mr. Zola replied that the revised General Plan would contain all of the changes discussed at all of the meetings and modifications would be made to reflect the changes in the final document.

Commissioner Patel wanted to discuss how mixed-use area and density would be applied. Mr. Zola pointed out that this area of discussion had been addressed in the Land Use Element and that this portion was supposed to summarize the Land Use Element requirements and only the portion of the Element that dealt with residential. Vice Chair Rosenbaum suggested to Commissioner Patel that he re-read the Land Use Element and present his comments and recommendations in writing to staff and Mr. Zola.

Commissioner Christianson requested clarification on Table 5.X – Zoning District Development Standards, on page 5-36. Mr. Zola explained that the lot sized/area described in the table were not minimum lot sizes, they were an expression of units per acre.

Mr. Elssmann asked how the numbers in the table related to single-family residential planned community and asked where the standard applied. Mr. Zola explained that it applied to the areas covered by the heading of each column, i.e. A-1, R-1, etc. Mr. Elssmann asked if there was an appropriate place in the text of the General Plan where language could be added to address Planned Community projects. Director Woldruff explained that each planned community development was different and a Planned Community Document was required for each. Mr. Zola noted that it would be appropriate to add language above Table 5.X on page 5-24 describing a Planned Community Zone.

Mr. Elssmann had a question relating to the size of dwelling units and wanted to know where the square footage of a unit was addressed as it pertained to affordable housing. Mr. Zola explained that Table 5.X reported what the City ordinance was and determine if the ordinance was placing constraints to the production of affordable housing. He added that housing advocates who had reviewed did not comment on the size of the units but were more interested on the issue parking standards. What would be appropriate in the section would be to add a discussion regarding possible constraints for affordable housing projects and initiating a discussion on the possible constraints to affordable housing development.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum referred to page 5-36 concerning Second Dwelling Units and asked if the deletion of a requirement of a Conditional Use Permit would be addressed in this section. Mr. Zola explained that language would be added stating that the requirement for a CUP was inconsistent with State law and would need to be changed. Vice Chair Rosenbaum continued and requested clarification of the last paragraph in this section, which referred to "standard minimum lot size". Mr. Zola stated that language would be added to justify retaining the standard.

Commissioner Christianson referred to the paragraph on Construction Costs on Page 5-41 and the statement of the cost for the construction of single-family home of \$40. Mr. Zola explained that it should be \$140 per square foot and would make the correction.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum suggested that the text should spell out that "More elaborate measures include solar water heating systems that supplement the traditional water heater" would be for new homes. Mr. Zola stated that the language would be changed.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum explained that she would like to insert a reminder to builders that the City of Loma Linda had energy conservation incentives, assistance and programs. Mr. Zola stated that language would be added in this section as another program.

Commissioner Patel wanted to know if there was a way to add text referring to sustainable architecture and the use of recycled construction materials. Director Woldruff agreed and would formulate text to that effect.

Mr. Zola pointed out to the Planning Commission that Section 2.2.3 on page 5-51 would be the appropriate section to discuss density bonuses. He stated that he would add the comment that as part of the other considerations, the kinds things that could be done, including the potential to reduced parking standards if developers could demonstrate that a real need. He added that it would also be an appropriate place to identify the revisions to the ordinance for second dwelling units and eliminating the Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Zola continued to discuss types of affordable housing that might be considered by modifying the zoning ordinance to permit some attached units within a single-family neighborhood, such as duplex lots and added that it would be appropriate to add the language to Section 2.2.6, which discussed zoning flexibility to allow multifamily units on parcels that might require variances.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum moved the discussion to page 5-52, Section 2.3.1 and pointed out that the implementation date should be changed. Mr. Zola replied that the whole document would be updated on all timing schedules in the final document.

She continued onto page 5-53, Section 2.3.4, Quantified Objective to clarify that housing assistance to 150 residents was the correct wording not residences. Mr. Zola stated that he would confirm the appropriate term.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum pointed to Page 5-54, Section 2.3.5 regarding Non-Quantified Objective and wished to add a reference to address high income housing. Mr. Zola stated that he would add the language for an additional program to address that issue.

Vice Chair Rosenbaum stated that there would be no time to open the discussion on Element 11 – General Plan Implementation Programs. Director Woldruff added that because of the changes that need to be added, Element 11 would need to be revised. Mr. Zola suggested that when staff returned with the fully revised element based on the comments received, Element 11 could then be reviewed.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and unanimously carried to continue the discussion of the Draft General Plan and the Draft Programs Environmental Impact Report to an adjourned meeting on June 23, 2004.

PC-04-30 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes available for approval.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by the Planning Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff informed the Planning Commission that there was an item on the City Council agenda to support Senate Bill 744, which would take away authority from local jurisdiction and support the League of California Cities. She added that the Council had adopted a resolution in opposition to the legislation. Commissioner Christianson asked Director Woldruff to clarify the intent of the bill. Director Woldruff explained that it would take away land use decisions that are made by local jurisdiction could be appealed to the State Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department and HCD could overturn the City's determination.

She added that there was also an assembly bill that would further add constraints on cities in terms of how the City regulated second units.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Patel, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to adjourn to a special meeting on June 9, 2004. (Neff and Essex absent)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Minutes approved at the special meeting of October 6, 2004

Administrative Secretary